



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/722,642	11/26/2003	Robert Gregory Petracosta	CW3A-113-260-01	7329
7590	02/22/2008		EXAMINER	
Benita J. Rohm, Esq.			HAGEMAN, MARK	
ROHM & MONSANTO, P.L.C.				
12 Rathbone Place			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Grosse Pointe, MI 48230				3653
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/722,642	PETRANCOSTA, ROBERT GREGORY
Examiner	Art Unit	
Mark Hageman	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2003.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 2-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 2-9 are listed as dependant from claims numbered 68, 71, and 73. As no claims with these numbers exist in the application it is not possible to determine from which claims these dependent claims actually depend and therefore determine the metes and bounds of the claims. As best understood by the examiner claims 2-6 and 8 depend from claim 1 while claim 7 depends from claim 6 and claim 9 depends from claim 8. The claims have been treated as having the dependencies discussed for the purpose of this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) based upon a public use or sale of the invention. United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit Case Nos 06-2262 and 06-2384 Con-Way Transportation Services Inc. v. Regscan states, "In 1999, Con-

Way representatives met with Regscan, Inc. ("Regscan") to discuss the possibility of developing Hazcalc in to a commercial product...In a written agreement dated May 3, 2000, Con-Way and Regscan agreed on a licensing arrangement...Regscan would develop HazCalc into a marketable product or products and Con-Way would receive 32% of the gross sales of any "commercial implementation" of HazCalc."

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,822,716 to Morell et al. Morell discloses an arrangement for selecting a determinable one of a plurality of placards, the arrangement comprising: an input arrangement (15) for facilitating entry of first material data corresponding to a first material; a classifications memory (14, 16, 20) for storing classification data corresponding to a plurality of hazard classifications; an exceptions memory (14, 16, 20) for storing exceptions data corresponding to a plurality of exceptions to the hazard classifications, at least one of the exceptions being selected in response to the input arrangement; a general rules memory (14, 16, 20) for storing general rules data corresponding to the plurality of placards; and a processor (11) for selecting the determinable one of the plurality of placards in response to said input arrangement, said classifications memory, said exceptions memory, and said general rules memory and a segregation memory (14, 16, 20) for storing data corresponding to a predetermined minimum spatial relationship between the first and second materials.

6. The language of the claims such as "for selecting..." and "for storing..." etc. is considered functional and fails to provide structural limitation to the claims. The Morell

device is readily capable of performing all of the claimed functions and therefore anticipates the claims, see MPEP 2115.

7. Regarding claims 2, 3, and 5 examiner notes that the claims are directed entirely to the contents of the memory devices. These limitations are functional in that they fail to provide any structural limitations to the claim. The memory devices of Morell (14, 16, and 20) are readily capable of containing such data and therefore Morell anticipates the claims.

8. Regarding claims 4 and 6-8 examiner notes that these claims are completely functional as they recite the input arrangement facilitating entry of certain data, and the processor arranged to perform a calculation. The keyboard of Morell is capable of facilitating any of the claimed data entry and the processor is readily capable of performing the weight conversion and therefore Morell anticipates the claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Hageman whose telephone number is (571) 272-3027. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick H. Mackey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3653

MCH